

Annex 16

Quantitative Analysis Results

I. Panel data analysis on level of perceived self-reliance

```

Random-effects GLS regression           Number of obs   =       392
Group variable: ID2                    Number of groups =       196
R-sq:                                   Obs per group:
    within = 0.0049                      min =           2
    between = 0.0815                     avg =          2.0
    overall = 0.0469                      max =           2
corr(u_i, X) = 0 (assumed)              Wald chi2(5)    =       17.64
                                           Prob > chi2     =       0.0034
    
```

Self_reliance	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
Time2	-.0479006	.0400337	-1.20	0.231	-.1263652 .030564
Sex	-.0566735	.0446585	-1.27	0.204	-.1442026 .0308556
Age	-.0430772	.0534987	-0.81	0.421	-.1479327 .0617784
Identity	-.1265892	.0489679	-2.59	0.010	-.2225645 -.0306138
Location	-.0726753	.0466992	-1.56	0.120	-.1642039 .0188534
_cons	2.728551	.0633041	43.10	0.000	2.604477 2.852624
sigma_u	.1186534				
sigma_e	.39325312				
rho	.08344047	(fraction of variance due to u_i)			

- The table suggests that there is no significant difference in the level of perceived self-reliance of the MRP beneficiaries during the baseline and endline assessments after controlling for the effect of the sex, age, identity group and location variables. This is supported by the p-value of the Time2 variable which is higher than 0.05. With COVID-19 occurring in between the baseline and endline assessment periods, this could mean that their perception about their ability to meet the basic needs of their family did not significantly decrease even with the onset of the pandemic.

2. Cross-tabulations and chi-square tests of independence involving employment-related outcomes

GROUP * ENGAGED IN PAID WORK/LIVELIHOOD CROSSTABULATION					
			ENGAGED		Total
			No	Yes	
GROUP	Comparison Group	Count	133	114	247
		% within GROUP	53.8%	46.2%	100.0%
	Intervention Group	Count	196	241	437
		% within GROUP	44.9%	55.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	329	355	684
		% within GROUP	48.1%	51.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Test: Engaged in paid work/livelihood

	Value	df	p-value	Sig. (2-sided)	Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.114 ^a	1	.024		
Continuity Correction ^b	4.761	1	.029		
Likelihood Ratio	5.117	1	.024		
Fisher's Exact Test				.026	.015
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.107	1	.024		

- There is a significant difference in the proportion of those who indicated that they are engaged in paid work between the intervention and comparison group. This is supported by the p-values of the significance test statistics which are less than 0.05 (e.g. Pearson chi-square). In particular, the

results suggest that the proportion of those who have paid work is significantly higher in the intervention group.

GROUP *RIGHTSKILLS_2 CROSSTABULATION

		RIGHTSKILLS_2			
		Disagree/strongly disagree	Agree/strongly agree	Total	
GROUP	Comparison Group	Count	82	163	245
		% within GROUP	33.5%	66.5%	100.0%
	Intervention Group	Count	85	344	429
		% within GROUP	19.8%	80.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	167	507	674
		% within GROUP	24.8%	75.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Test: Have the right skills to find a job

	Value	df	p-value	Sig. (2-sided)	Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.603 ^a	1	.000		
Continuity Correction ^b	14.879	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	15.244	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.579	1	.000		

- There is a significant difference in the proportion of those who indicated that they have the rights skills to find a job between the intervention and comparison group. This is supported by the p-values of the significance test statistics which are less than 0.05 (e.g. Pearson chi-square). This further implies that the proportion of those who have paid work is significantly higher in the intervention group.

GROUP*JOBCONFIDENCE_2 CROSSTABULATION

		JOBCONFIDENCE_2			
		Disagree/strongly disagree	Agree/strongly agree	Total	
GROUP	Comparison Group	Count	102	121	223
		% within GROUP	45.7%	54.3%	100.0%
	Intervention Group	Count	166	234	400
		% within GROUP	41.5%	58.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	268	355	623
		% within GROUP	43.0%	57.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Test: Confident to find a job

	Value	df	p-value	Sig. (2-sided)	Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.050 ^a	1	.305		
Continuity Correction ^b	.884	1	.347		
Likelihood Ratio	1.048	1	.306		
Fisher's Exact Test				.312	.174
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.048	1	.306		

- The chi-square test results indicate that there is no significant difference in the proportion of the intervention and comparison group respondents those who indicated that they are confident they will find a new paid work if they lose their current job. This is supported by the p-values of the significance tests which are all greater than the level of significance which is 0.05.

3. Panel data analysis on level of polarization

Random-effects GLS regression
 Group variable: ID2
 R-sq:
 within = 0.0160
 between = 0.0546
 overall = 0.0318

Number of obs = 392
 Number of groups = 196
 Obs per group:
 min = 2
 avg = 2.0
 max = 2

corr(u _i , X) = 0 (assumed)				Wald chi2(5)	=	12.69
				Prob > chi2	=	0.0265
POL_AVE	Coef.	Std. Err.	Z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Time2	-.0610077	.0262176	2.33	0.020	-.1123932	-.0096221
Sex	.0033484	.0272052	0.12	0.902	-.0499728	.0566696
Age	.0541578	.0327432	1.65	0.098	-.0100178	.1183334
Identity	.0117803	.0295935	0.40	0.691	-.0462219	.0697826
Location	-.0687964	.0282429	-2.44	0.015	-.1241515	-.0134413
_cons	3.022025	.038732	78.02	0.000	2.946112	3.097938
sigma_u	0					
sigma_e	.27873687					
rho	0 (fraction of variance due to u _i)					

- The results indicate that there is a significant difference in the level of perceived polarization of the MRP beneficiaries during the baseline and endline assessments. In particular, their perception that polarization exists in their community has significantly decreased during the endline after controlling for the effect of the sex, age, identity group and location variables.

4. Panel data analysis on level of trust

Random-effects GLS regression				Number of obs	=	392
Group variable: ID2				Number of groups	=	196
R-sq:				Obs per group:		
within	= 0.0200			min	= 2	
between	= 0.1158			avg	= 2.0	
overall	= 0.0662			max	= 2	
corr(u _i , X) = 0 (assumed)				Wald chi2(5)	=	27.36
				Prob > chi2	=	0.0000
Trust	Coef.	Std. Err.	Z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Time2	.0576639	.037088	1.55	0.046	-.0150272	.130355
Sex	-.0156487	.0384851	-0.41	0.684	-.091078	.0597806
Age	.0531769	.0463193	1.15	0.251	-.0376072	.1439611
Identity	.0364346	.0418636	0.87	0.384	-.0456166	.1184858
Location	-.19056	.039953	-4.77	0.000	-.2688664	-.1122535
_cons	3.226377	.0547912	58.88	0.000	3.118988	3.333766
sigma_u	0					
sigma_e	.38062641					
rho	0 (fraction of variance due to u _i)					

- There is a significant difference in the level of perceived level of trust of the MRP beneficiaries during the baseline and endline assessments. The regression coefficient for Time2 suggests that their overall perception of trust has significantly increased during the endline after controlling for the effect of the sex, age, identity group and location variables.

5. Independent samples t-test on level of trust between comparison and intervention groups

Independent Samples T-Test: Level of trust

	t	df	p	Cohen's d
Trust	-6.047	682	<.001	0.481

Note. Student's t-test.

- The table suggests that the level of trust between the intervention and comparison group is significantly different. In particular, the level of trust of MRP beneficiaries is significantly higher than those who did receive MRP interventions.

6. Panel data analysis on level of public participation

```

Random-effects GLS regression              Number of obs   =       390
Group variable: ID2                       Number of groups =       196

R-sq:                                     Obs per group:
  within = 0.0005                          min =           1
  between = 0.0167                         avg =           2.0
  overall = 0.0085                          max =           2

corr(u_i, X) = 0 (assumed)                 Wald chi2(5)    =         3.30
                                           Prob > chi2     =         0.6535

```

Representa~n	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
Time2	.0032876	.0534898	-0.06	0.951	-.1081257 .1015504
Sex	-.0364973	.0555051	-0.66	0.511	-.1452854 .0722907
Age	.0053941	.0670318	0.08	0.936	-.1259858 .1367741
Identity	-.0158245	.06042	-0.26	0.793	-.1342455 .1025965
Location	-.0829701	.0575709	-1.44	0.150	-.1958069 .0298667
_cons	2.758363	.0794098	34.74	0.000	2.602723 2.914003
sigma_u	0				
sigma_e	.52663126				
rho	0	(fraction of variance due to u_i)			

- The results indicate that there is no significant difference in the level of perceived public participation of the MRP beneficiaries during the baseline and endline assessments after controlling for the effect of the sex, age, identity group and location variables. While their perception has shown an increase, the magnitude of the increase is not statistically significant.

7. Independent samples t-test on level of public participation between comparison and intervention groups

Independent Samples T-Test: Level of Public Participation

	t	df	P	Cohen's d
Public Participation	-13.982	682	< .001	1.113

Note. Student's t-test.

- The comparative analysis results indicate that the level of perceived public participation between the intervention and comparison group is significantly different. In particular, the perceived level of public participation of MRP beneficiaries is significantly higher than those who did receive MRP interventions.